

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the notice that claims 21, 22 and 24 are still allowed and that claims 3, 9, 15 and 17 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. However, as noted below, Applicant also respectfully submits that the reference does not teach the claimed subject matter as amended.

Claims 10 and 12-15 have been objected to due to informalities. The typographical error has been corrected.

Claims 10, 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite. The typographical errors have been corrected.

Claims 16, 18, 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,058,739 (Wu). The Wu reference is directed to a wireless peripheral interface with universal serial bus port that employs multiple and different types of hubs. A wired hub 12 and a wireless hub 14 are connected to a host system and the wireless hub 4 is wirelessly coupled to wireless devices 16, 17 and 18. Applicant has amended the claims to include inherent subject matter. As claimed, the method of remote connecting is performed by a single remote connector. Wu describes a different architecture and one that requires multiple differing types of hubs and multiple wireless devices.

In contrast, Applicant claims, among other things, a remote connector that provides peripheral component ports that are capable of receiving a peripheral component for communication with a remote processing system having another power supply. It is alleged that the hub 12 in Wu corresponds to the claimed remote connector. However, the remote connector also requires a wirelessly receiving a wireless command from a remote device. This is alleged to be wireless hub 14 in the office action. As such, the office action cites to two different hubs, one

wired and one wireless in Wu in an effort to anticipate claims which are directed to a single remote connector having differing operations as claimed. The connector 12 does not, inter alia, wirelessly receive wireless commands from a remote device nor does it generate a wake up command in response to the wireless command. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that the subject matter is not taught or suggested in the Wu reference. Accordingly, the claim is in condition for allowance.

The dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12-14 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Wu in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,963,935 (Young). Applicant respectfully reasserts the relevant remarks made above with respect to Wu since the same rejection as to Wu has been provided with respect to these independent claims. For example, claim 1 is directed to “a remote connector” and that the single remote connector requires a wireless receiver capable of wireless receiving a wireless command from a remote device, as well as a plurality of ports capable of physically receiving a peripheral component. The office action alleges that Wu teaches a single remote connector that includes these elements but instead refers to wired hub 12 and separate wireless hub 14. The office action alleges that Wu describes a remote connector “combination of 12 and 14”. However, Applicant does not claim a plurality of different types of connectors as in Wu, but a single connector that includes the structure therein and also respectfully submits that such an interpretation is inconsistent with not only the claim language itself but Applicant’s Specification. Claim interpretations that are inconsistent with the claim itself and the Specification are improper. Since Wu does not teach the claimed subject matter as alleged, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance.

New claim 26 is allowable claim 9 written in independent form.

The dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

Also, Applicant has amended claim 21 and others merely as to form indicating as originally filed that the peripheral component may be an input device or an output device or an input/output device.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 17, 2009

By: /Christopher J. Reckamp/
Christopher J. Reckamp
Registration No. 34,414

Vedder Price P.C.
222 North LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60601
phone: (312) 609-7599
fax: (312) 609-5005